



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/750,183	12/31/2003	David P. Marmaros	16113-1317001 / GP-178-00	5002
26192	7590	02/05/2009		
FISH & RICHARDSON P.C. PO BOX 1022 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55440-1022				
EXAMINER				
TRUONG, CAM Y T				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2169				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/05/2009		ELECTRONIC		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PATDOCTC@fr.com

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/750,183

**Applicant(s)**

MARMAROS ET AL.

**Examiner**

Cam Y T. Truong

**Art Unit**

2169

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-9, 11, 35, 37-42, 59 and 60 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 4-9, 11, 35, 37, 37-42, 59-60 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 December 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Applicant has amended claims 1, 4-9, 11, 35, 37, 37-42 and added claims 59-60 in the amendment filed on 11/12/2008.

Claims 1, 4-9, 11, 35, 37, 37-42, 59-60 are pending in this Office Action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 4-9, 11, 35, 37, 37-42, 59-60 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The 101 rejection, 112 rejection and claim object for claims are withdrawn based on the amendment filed on 11/12/2008 and applicant's argument on page 1.

Applicant's argument on page Applicant argued that the combination of Hennings and Cupps does not disclose, teach, or suggest the claimed navigation "directly to a portion of the respective query-relevant snippet within the corresponding search result document when the query-relevant snippet is selected by a user from the display of the corresponding search result on the client device" as recited in claim 1.

Examiner respectfully disagrees. Cupps teaches FIGS. 8-10 are exemplary menu web pages 144. FIG. 8 is a menu web page 144 showing the first five pizza restaurants that deliver within a particular customer's location. The restaurants shown are selected based on the customer's location and the restaurant's delivery area. As such, this menu web page 144 is dynamically created for this particular customer. Likewise, FIG. 9 is a menu web page 144 showing the various types of food items that a particular restaurant offers for delivery service within a particular customer's location.

This menu web page 144 was created in response to the customer's request for pizza selections. FIG. 10 is a menu web page 144 showing the various types of "pesce fresco" items that a particular restaurant offers for delivery service within a particular customers location. This menu web page 144 was created in response to the customer's request for "pesce fresco" selections (col. 9, lines 15-35). The above information shows that as Enzo's is extracted from web page of fig. 8 to display to a user in another web page of fig. 9 by a search engine after a user selection.

The customer can then select a particular vendor or restaurant and one or more menu web pages 144 including the selected information that is dynamically created by the web creation procedure 126 and provided to the customer's client computer 102. The customer can then browse through the menu web pages 144 and select items of interest. The user's selection or requests are used by the web creation procedure 126 to generate one or more menu web pages 144 that are displayed to the customer (step 306). FIGS. 8-10 illustrate such exemplary menu web pages 144. The customer places an order by selecting the appropriate items from the menu web pages 144 (step 308) which are then transmitted to the online ordering machine 106 (step 310). The online ordering machine 106 receives the order and processes it as shown in FIG. 13 (step 310) (col. 10, lines 7-3). The above information shows that the creation procedure 126 is created for search results to allow a user to navigate directly a portion of the 'pesce fresco' within the webpage when the user selects the 'pesce fresco'. The creation procedure 126 is represented as an instruction for search results. Pesce

fresco is represented as the query-relevant snippet that is selected by a user from a display of the corresponding search results on the customer device.

**Remark:** the term "a computer-readable storage device" is interpreted as a hardware device as shown in fig. 10, paragraph 0053 of the specification.

### ***Claim Objections***

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities:

The term "the respective query-relevant snippet" in claim 1, line 17 should be written as "the query-relevant snippet" since it refers back to the term "the query-relevant snippet" in claim 1, line 8 to avoid insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The term "the corresponding search result" in claim 1, lines 18-19, should be written as "the corresponding search result document" since it refers back to the term "the corresponding search result document" in claim 1, line 7.

Claim 35 is objected to because of the following informalities: The term "the corresponding search result" in claim 35, lines 17 should be written as "the corresponding search result document" since it refers back to the term "the corresponding search result document" in claim 35, lines 7-8.

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 35 and 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider (US 6895430) in view of Cupps et al (or hereinafter "Cupps") (US 5991739).

As to claim 1, Schneider teaches the claimed limitations:

"receiving in a search engine a search query from a client device" as sending a search query to a search server from client, the server returns search results responsive to the search query to search client (figs. 1d, 5b-6b, col. 12, lines 5-15; col. 17, lines 35-67), the search query including one or more query terms" as the query including as query term (fig. 5b, col. 17, lines 55-67; col. 18, lines 1-25);

"generating in the search engine two or more search results in response to the search query" as displaying two or more search results in response to the search query including query term (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67);

"each of the search results including a corresponding search result document link to a corresponding search result document" as shown in fig. 6b, each search result

including a link such as [www.com](http://www.com) to a corresponding document (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67);

“each of the search results including a query-relevant snippet, the query-relevant snippet being text extracted from the corresponding search result document by the search engine” as (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67; col. 15, lines 25-60);

“to display the search result including the query-relevant snippets of the search result on the client device” as displaying the search results including the query-relevant snippets (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67; col. 15, lines 25-60);

“providing from the search engine the instructions for each of the two or more search results to the client device in response to the search query” as providing from the search engine the instructions such as search within this sites for search results (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67; col. 15, lines 25-60).

Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations “generating in the search engine an instruction for each of the two or more search results that is configured to cause the client device” “to navigate directly to a portion of the respective query-relevant snippet within the corresponding search result document when the query-relevant snippet is selected by a user from a display of the corresponding search result on the client device”;

Cupps teaches FIGS. 8-10 are exemplary menu web pages 144. FIG. 8 is a menu web page 144 showing the first five pizza restaurants that deliver within a particular customer's location. The restaurants shown are selected based on the customer's location and the restaurant's delivery area. As such, this menu web page

144 is dynamically created for this particular customer. Likewise, FIG. 9 is a menu web page 144 showing the various types of food items that a particular restaurant offers for delivery service within a particular customer's location. This menu web page 144 was created in response to the customer's request for pizza selections. FIG. 10 is a menu web page 144 showing the various types of "pesce fresco" items that a particular restaurant offers for delivery service within a particular customers location. This menu web page 144 was created in response to the customer's request for "pesce fresco" selections (col. 9, lines 15-35). The above information shows that as Enzo's is extracted from web page of fig. 8 to display to a user in another web page of fig. 9 by a search engine after a user selection.

The customer can then select a particular vendor or restaurant and one or more menu web pages 144 including the selected information that is dynamically created by the web creation procedure 126 and provided to the customer's client computer 102. The customer can then browse through the menu web pages 144 and select items of interest. The user's selection or requests are used by the web creation procedure 126 to generate one or more menu web pages 144 that are displayed to the customer (step 306). FIGS. 8-10 illustrate such exemplary menu web pages 144. The customer places an order by selecting the appropriate items from the menu web pages 144 (step 308) which are then transmitted to the online ordering machine 106 (step 310). The online ordering machine 106 receives the order and processes it as shown in FIG. 13 (step 310) (col. 10, lines 7-3). The above information shows that the creation procedure 126 is created for search results to allow a user to navigate directly a portion



of the 'pesce fresco' within the webpage when the user selects the 'pesce fresco'. The creation procedure 126 is represented as an instruction for search results. Pesce fresco is represented as the query-relevant snippet that is selected by a user from a display of the corresponding search results on the customer device.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Cupp's teaching of using the creation procedure 126 to navigate a portion of search result based on user's selection to Schneider's system in order to allow a client to narrow down search result following his or her desire so that searching a search result is performed quickly.

As to claim 35, Schneider teaches a computer program product embodied on a computer-readable storage device, the computer program product including instructions, which when executed by a computer system, are operable to cause the computer system to perform acts ( computer program in a storage medium, figs. 1d-1f, lines 40-67), comprising:

"generating two or more search results in response to a search query from a client device" as displaying two or more search results in response to the search query including query term (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67),

" the search query including one or more query terms, each of the search results being including a corresponding search result document link to a corresponding search result document" as shown in figs. 6a-6b, each search result including a link such as www....com to a corresponding document (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67),

"each of the search results including a query-relevant snippet extracted from the corresponding search result document" as (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67; col. 15, lines 25-60);

"to display the search result including the query-relevant snippets of the search result on the client device" as displaying the search results including the query-relevant snippets as (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67; col. 15, lines 25-60);

"providing the instructions for each of the two or more search results to the client device in response to the search query" as providing from the search engine instructions (figs. 5b-6b, col. 19, lines 40-67; col. 15, lines 25-60).

Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitations "generating an instruction for each of the two or more search results that is configured to cause the client device" "to navigate directly to a portion of respective query-relevant snippets within the search result document when the query-relevant snippet is selected by a user from a display of the corresponding search result on the client device".

Cupps teaches FIGS. 8-10 are exemplary menu web pages 144. FIG. 8 is a menu web page 144 showing the first five pizza restaurants that deliver within a particular customer's location. The restaurants shown are selected based on the customer's location and the restaurant's delivery area. As such, this menu web page 144 is dynamically created for this particular customer. Likewise, FIG. 9 is a menu web page 144 showing the various types of food items that a particular restaurant offers for delivery service within a particular customer's location. This menu web page 144 was created in response to the customer's request for pizza selections. FIG. 10 is a menu

web page 144 showing the various types of "pesce fresco" items that a particular restaurant offers for delivery service within a particular customers location. This menu web page 144 was created in response to the customer's request for "pesce fresco" selections (col. 9, lines 15-35). The above information shows that as Enzo's is extracted from web page of fig. 8 to display to a user in another web page of fig. 9 by a search engine after a user selection. The Enzo's is represented as the query-relevant snippet being text extracted from the corresponding search result page as document;

The above information shows that as Enzo's is extracted from web page of fig. 8 to display to a user in another web page of fig. 9 by a search engine after a user selection.

The customer can then select a particular vendor or restaurant and one or more menu web pages 144 including the selected information that is dynamically created by the web creation procedure 126 and provided to the customer's client computer 102. The customer can then browse through the menu web pages 144 and select items of interest. The user's selection or requests are used by the web creation procedure 126 to generate one or more menu web pages 144 that are displayed to the customer (step 306). FIGS. 8-10 illustrate such exemplary menu web pages 144. The customer places an order by selecting the appropriate items from the menu web pages 144 (step 308) which are then transmitted to the online ordering machine 106 (step 310). The online ordering machine 106 receives the order and processes it as shown in FIG. 13 (step 310) (col. 10, lines 7-3). The above information shows that the creation procedure 126 is created for search results to allow a user to navigate directly a portion

of the 'pesce fresco' within the webpage when the user selects the 'pesce fresco'. The creation procedure 126 is represented as an instruction for search results. Pesce fresco is represented as the query-relevant snippet that is selected by a user from a display of the corresponding search results on the customer device.

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Cup's teaching of using the creation procedure 126 to navigate a portion of search result based on user's selection to Schneider's system in order to allow a client to narrow down search result following his or her desire so that searching a search result is performed quickly.

As to claim 59, Schneider and Cup teaches the above claimed limitation subject, Cup further teach the claimed limitations "wherein: each of the search results comprises a plurality of query-relevant snippets extracted from the corresponding search result document; and the instruction for each of the two or more search results is configured to cause the client device to display each of the plurality of query-relevant snippets on the client device and to navigate directly to a portion of a respective one of the plurality of query-relevant snippets within the corresponding search result document when the respective query-relevant snippet is selected by a user from a display of the corresponding search result on the client device" as FIGS. 8-10 are exemplary menu web pages 144. FIG. 8 is a menu web page 144 showing the first five pizza restaurants that deliver within a particular customer's location. The restaurants shown are selected based on the customer's location and the restaurant's delivery

area. As such, this menu web page 144 is dynamically created for this particular customer. Likewise, FIG. 9 is a menu web page 144 showing the various types of food items that a particular restaurant offers for delivery service within a particular customer's location. This menu web page 144 was created in response to the customer's request for pizza selections. FIG. 10 is a menu web page 144 showing the various types of "pesce fresco" items that a particular restaurant offers for delivery service within a particular customers location. This menu web page 144 was created in response to the customer's request for "pesce fresco" selections (col. 9, lines 15-35). The customer can then select a particular vendor or restaurant and one or more menu web pages 144 including the selected information that is dynamically created by the web creation procedure 126 and provided to the customer's client computer 102. The customer can then browse through the menu web pages 144 and select items of interest. The user's selection or requests are used by the web creation procedure 126 to generate one or more menu web pages 144 that are displayed to the customer (step 306). FIGS. 8-10 illustrate such exemplary menu web pages 144. The customer places an order by selecting the appropriate items from the menu web pages 144 (step 308) which are then transmitted to the online ordering machine 106 (step 310). The online ordering machine 106 receives the order and processes it as shown in FIG. 13 (step 310) (col. 10, lines 7-3).

As to claim 60, Schneider and Cup teaches the above claimed limitation subject, Cup further teach the claimed limitations "wherein: each of the search results

comprises a plurality of query-relevant snippets extracted from the corresponding search result document; and the instruction for each of the two or more search results is configured to cause the client device to display each of the plurality of query-relevant snippets on the client device and to navigate directly to a portion of a respective one of the plurality of query-relevant snippets within the corresponding search result document when the respective query-relevant snippet is selected by a user from a display of the corresponding search result on the client device" as FIGS. 8-10 are exemplary menu web pages 144. FIG. 8 is a menu web page 144 showing the first five pizza restaurants that deliver within a particular customer's location. The restaurants shown are selected based on the customer's location and the restaurant's delivery area. As such, this menu web page 144 is dynamically created for this particular customer. Likewise, FIG. 9 is a menu web page 144 showing the various types of food items that a particular restaurant offers for delivery service within a particular customer's location. This menu web page 144 was created in response to the customer's request for pizza selections. FIG. 10 is a menu web page 144 showing the various types of "pesce fresco" items that a particular restaurant offers for delivery service within a particular customers location. This menu web page 144 was created in response to the customer's request for "pesce fresco" selections (col. 9, lines 15-35). The customer can then select a particular vendor or restaurant and one or more menu web pages 144 including the selected information that is dynamically created by the web creation procedure 126 and provided to the customer's client computer 102. The customer can then browse through the menu web pages 144 and select items of

interest. The user's selection or requests are used by the web creation procedure 126 to generate one or more menu web pages 144 that are displayed to the customer (step 306). FIGS. 8-10 illustrate such exemplary menu web pages 144. The customer places an order by selecting the appropriate items from the menu web pages 144 (step 308) which are then transmitted to the online ordering machine 106 (step 310). The online ordering machine 106 receives the order and processes it as shown in FIG. 13 (step 310) (col. 10, lines 7-3).

5. Claims 4 and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider (US 6895430) in view of Cupps and further in view of Hennings et al (or hereinafter "Hennings") (US 6763496).

As to claims 4 and 37, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein each instruction includes an intra-document link for the query-relevant snippet, each intra-document link pointing to the portion of the query-relevant snippet within the corresponding search result document".

Hennings teaches homepage 100 is at the top level of the content hierarchy, and there is a nested page for each of the travel categories that can be reached by either clicking one of the picture icons or one of the associated text hyperlink anchors. For instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text hyperlink anchor 112 will link the browser to Cruises page 118, causing the Cruises page to open in the browser. The Cruises page, and the pages associated with the other travel categories (e.g., Air Travel page, Trains page, etc., are all nested at a second level of the content hierarchy. As with the

homepage 100, Cruises page 118 also contains hyperlinks pointing to pages that are nested below it, including Alaska hyperlink 120, Caribbean hyperlink 122, Puerto Rico hyperlink 124, and Mexico hyperlink 126. Each of these hyperlinks can be used to locate a page at a third level of the content hierarchy (fig. 2, col. 6, lines 47-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hennings's teaching of homepage 100 is at the top level of the content hierarchy, and there is a nested page for each of the travel categories that can be reached by either clicking one of the picture icons or one of the associated text hyperlink anchors. For instance, clicking on either icon 104 or text hyperlink anchor 112 will link the browser to Cruises page 118, causing the Cruises page to open in the browser. The Cruises page, and the pages associated with the other travel categories (e.g., Air Travel page, Trains page, etc., are all nested at a second level of the content hierarchy. As with the homepage 100, Cruises page 118 also contains hyperlinks pointing to pages that are nested below it, including Alaska hyperlink 120, Caribbean hyperlink 122, Puerto Rico hyperlink 124, and Mexico hyperlink 126. Each of these hyperlinks can be used to locate a page at a third level of the content hierarchy to Schneider's system in order to system in order to allow a client to narrow down search result following his or her desire so that searching a search result is performed quickly.

6. Claims 5-7 and 38-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider (US 6895430) in view of Cupps and further in view of Hennings et al (or



hereinafter "Hennings") (US 6763496) and Caronni et al (or hereinafter "Caronni") (US 2003/0154221).

As to claim 5, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein each intra-document link contains an artificial anchor undefined in the corresponding search result document".

Caronni teaches when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1.txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup routine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for searching (fig. 4, paragraph [0030, 0037]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Caronni's teaching of when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1.txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup routine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for searching to Schneider's system in order to allow processes to enforce different views

dependent on the context that a process is in and retrieve information corresponding to the expanded sequence.

As to claim 6, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein each artificial anchor includes a preassigned artificial anchor designator designating the anchor as artificial".

Caronni teaches when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1.txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup routine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for searching. S:\eng\ is represented as artificial anchor designator (fig. 4, paragraph [0030, 0037]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Caronni's teaching of when lookup routine determines that an entry corresponding to the entity name does not exist, it checks the system view table for an alternate file system entry. For example, if the lookup routine expands the entity name with a first uncommon string and no corresponding entry is found, the lookup routine may subsequently expand the entity name with a second uncommon string. The link S:\eng\user123\file 1.txt contains user123 as an artificial anchor; thus, the lookup routine expands the entity name with a second uncommon string for

searching to Schneider's system in order to allow processes to enforce different views dependent on the context that a process is in and retrieve information corresponding to the expanded sequence.

As to claim 7, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein each artificial anchor includes the preassigned artificial anchor designator as one of a prefix and a suffix and wherein the preassigned artificial anchor designator includes a preassigned set of text characters".

Caronni teaches S:\eng\ as prefix. This prefix includes a set of character such as user123\file1.txt or user342\file1.txt . The S:\eng\ as anchor designator (fig. 4).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Caronni's teaching of \eng\ as prefix. This prefix includes a set of character such as user123\file1.txt or user342\file1.txt to Schneider's system in order to allow processes to enforce different views dependent on the context that a process is in and retrieve information corresponding to the expanded sequence.

Claim 38 is rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 5.

Claim 39 is rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 6.

Claim 40 is rejected under the same reason as discussed in claim 7.

7. Claims 8-9 and 41-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider (US 6895430) in view of Cupps and further in view of Hennings et al (or

hereinafter "Hennings") (US 6763496) and Hill et al (or hereinafter "Hill") (US 2004/0024788).

As to claim 8, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein each intra-document link points to an anchor defined in the corresponding search result document".

Hill teaches Plant-Models List 20 gives a user a list of models of machines in the plant. Model 24 is a gateway that would list all of the units in the plant that are of the requested. The above information shows that the Plant-Model list 20 as a link to Model 24 as an anchor at the unit in the plant (paragraphs [0052, 0091]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hill's teaching to Schneider's system in order to organize web pages of documents in hierarchy manner from a broad entity to a more specific entity so that a user can easily view modify a portion of a document easily and identify associations between documents within web pages.

As to claim 9, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "determining whether each corresponding search result document link references an anchor defined in each corresponding search result document; and stripping the reference to the anchor from the corresponding search result document link if the search result document link references the anchor".

Hill teaches Plant-Models list page 20 contains a link back to parent Model page 24. It means that when a user want to back to parent Model page 24, the user select a

link back in Plant-Model list page 20 and the system will strip the link to the parent Model page 24 as anchor (paragraph [0091]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hill's teaching of Plant-Models list page 20 contains a link back to parent Model page 24 to Schneider's system in order to organize web pages of documents in hierarchy manner from a broad entity to a more specific entity so that a user can easily view modify a portion of a document easily and identify associations between documents within web pages.

As to claim 41, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein each intra-document link points to an anchor defined in the corresponding search result document".

Hill teaches Plant-Models List 20 gives a user a list of models of machines in the plant. Model 24 is a gateway that would list all of the units in the plant that are of the requested. The above information shows that the Plant-Model list 20 as a link to Model 24 as an anchor at the unit in the plant (paragraphs [0052, 0091]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hill's teaching Schneider's system in order to organize web pages of documents in hierarchy manner from a broad entity to a more specific entity so that a user can easily view modify a portion of a document easily and identify associations between documents within web pages.

As to claim 42, Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation “determining whether a corresponding search result document link in one of the search results references an anchor defined in the corresponding search result document; and stripping the reference to the anchor from the corresponding search result document link if the corresponding search result document link references the anchor”.

Hill teaches Plant-Models list page 20 contains a link back to parent Model page 24. It means that when a user want to back to parent Model page 24, the user select a link back in Plant-Model list page 20 and the system will strip the link to the parent Model page 24 as anchor (paragraph [0091]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to apply Hill's teaching of Plant-Models list page 20 contains a link back to parent Model page 24 to Schneider's system in order to organize web pages of documents in hierarchy manner from a broad entity to a more specific entity so that a user can easily view modify a portion of a document easily and identify associations between documents within web pages.

8. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider (US 6895430) in view of Cupps and further in view of Shanny (US 20040158617).

As to claim 11, Schneider teaches the claimed limitation “wherein the providing the instructions for each of the two or more search results to the client device in response to the query includes providing a search result page” as (figs. 1d, 5a-6b).

Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the instruction is at least one of a hidden tag and an attribute on a tag in the search result page".

Shanny teaches hidden tag (paragraph [0041]).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to apply Shanny's teaching of hidden tag to Schneider's system in order to allow transmission of all the input data as result data when instructions for submit are made and further to detect page load abandons in real time.

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schneider (US 6895430) in view of Cupps and further in view of Streble (US 6973492).

As to claim 11, Schneider teaches the claimed limitation "wherein the providing the instructions for each of the two or more search results to the client device in response to the query includes providing a search result page" as (figs. 1d, 5a-6b).

Schneider does not explicitly teach the claimed limitation "wherein the instruction is at least one of a hidden tag and an attribute on a tag in the search result page".

Streble teaches tag with a hidden attribute (col. 4, lines 56-60).

It would have been obvious to a person of an ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to apply Streble's teaching of tag with a hidden attribute to Schneider's system in order to allow transmission of all the input data as result data when instructions for submit are made and further to detect page load abandons in real time.

### ***Conclusion***

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ferrari et al US 20030097357 A1 relates to search database (see abstract).

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

### ***Contact Information***



11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cam Y T. Truong whose telephone number is (571) 272-4042. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Breene can be reached on (571) 272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Cam Y Truong/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2162